DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 121 788 SP 010 053

AUTHOR Goddu, Roland
TITLE Standards for Evaluating Teacher Education Programs in Higher Education Institutions.
INSTITUTION New England Program in Teacher Education, Durham, N.H.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 11p.
AVAILABLE FROM New England Program in Teacher Education, Pettee Brook Offices, Durham, New Hampshire

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS Curriculum Evaluation; Educational Assessment; *Evaluation Criteria; Evaluation Methods; *Program Evaluation; *Schools of Education; *Teacher Education; *Teacher Education Curriculum; Teacher Educators; Teacher Evaluation; Teachers Colleges

ABSTRACT

This set of standards for evaluating teacher education programs is organized into seven categories: (1) targets (social, institutional, role, and learner expectations); (2) mission, goals, and purposes; (3) objectives; (4) resource allocation; (5) programs; (6) outcomes; and (7) evaluation. The set of standards is based on the assumption that programs for teacher preparation should be a coherent, clear, and integrated attempt to prepare personnel for education roles in existing institutions. It also assumes that existing schools have societal, institutional, and learner goals that personnel in such roles are committed to implement and develop. The set of standards is organized as a series of questions which determine the existence of a characteristic. This characteristic, once determined, suggests that a value judgment about the actual operation of a program should be made with care taken to base the judgment on observable events rather than on rhetoric. More detailed questions may be added as appropriate, particularly when a specific innovation is being tested. (Author/JMF)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED121788

NEPTE
Winter, 1976

STANDARDS FOR EVALUATING TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS

INTRODUCTION

1. This set of standards is based on the assumption that programs for the preparation of teachers should be a coherent, clear, and integrated attempt to prepare personnel for education roles in existing institutions. It also assumes that existing schools have societal, institutional and learner goals that personnel in such roles are committed to implement and develop.

2. The set of standards is organized as a series of questions which determine the existence of a characteristic. Once this characteristic is determined to exist, it is suggested that a value judgment about the actual operation of a program should be made with care taken to base the judgment on observable events rather than rhetoric. More detailed questions may be added as appropriate particularly when a specific innovation is being tested.

3. The set of standards is organized as follows:
   (a) TARGETS: SOCIAL, INSTITUTIONAL, ROLE and LEARNER EXPECTATIONS
   (b) MISSION, GOALS, PURPOSES
   (c) objectives
   (d) resource allocation
   (e) programs
   (f) outcomes
   (g) evaluation

STANDARDS

A. TARGETS

1. Does the program, department, college, institution have a written statement of purpose, mission, which states the perspective it holds about learning, teaching, schooling, and society?

2. Does the program, department, college, institution indicate what education roles, what levels of schooling and what particular approach to education it espouses, or promotes?

3. Does the program, department, college, institution indicate the geographic, social, and learner characteristics it intends to serve?

4. Does the program, department, college, institution state the knowledge, attitudes, and skills they expect the persons they educate to be able to transmit to learners?

B. MISSION

1. Does the program, department, college, institution provide a written statement of mission to faculty, students, affiliated agencies, and the public?

2. Does the statement of mission provide a coherent rationale for action by faculty, students and the public?

3. Is there a public procedure by which faculty implementation of statement of mission is monitored?

4. Is there a public procedure by which the statement of mission is reviewed and modified by faculty, students and the public?

C. OBJECTIVES

1. Does the program, department, college, institutions have complete descriptive lists of knowledge, attitudes, skills, and other abilities that persons educated in a teacher education program will have at entry, performance, and mastery levels or at bachelors, masters or specialists degree level?

2. Does the program, department, college, institution have a projection of number and types of educational personnel who have completed or have a program in process with specific reference to positions available?

3. Does the program, department, college, institution have selected innovations or programs for schools which it expects to disseminate and evaluate?

4. Does the program, department, college, institution have special knowledge, attitudes, skills, or other abilities that are being emphasized to respond to a special need?

D. RESOURCE ALLOCATION

1. Does the program, department, college, institution have an allocated budget which assures personnel, materials, travel, development funds for each program offered?

2. Does each program have competent faculty assigned including practitioners who demonstrate alternative forms of acceptable practice?

3. Does the management system support the program and provide adequate resources for evaluation and development?

4. Does the program, department, college, institution have secretarial support, curriculum materials, library, spare facilities, etc. to support the academic program on campus and in the field?

E. PROGRAM

1. For each program is there a plan for assuring that students have clear guidelines from admission to graduation?

2. For each program is there a documentation of the offerings on campus and in the field?

3. For each program is there evidence that modifications come from student and profession needs as well as faculty needs?

4. Does the program provide for exposure to and experience with multiple forms of the state of the art in education practice?

F. OUTCOMES

1. Does the program have documentation of effect of program on all admitted candidates including a follow up?

2. Does the program have documentation of effect of practice and research on the faculty?

3. Does the program have documentation of effect of graduates in schools?

4. Does the program have documentation of changes made to improve, develop, or amend existing activities?

G. EVALUATION

1. Does the program document activities and analyze them in terms of objectives, plans, and resource allocation?

2. Does the program document outcomes and analyze them in terms of social, institutional, role, and learner expectations?

3. Does the program prepare yearly reports to student, faculty, and the school about its efforts?

4. Does the program prepare a yearly assessment of students, faculty, programs and administration?

CONCLUSION

1. There exist many more detailed evaluation formats for teacher education programs. This approach suggests a limited and targeted set of questions based on a coherent, interrelated program development and management system. It assumes that an evaluation needs to provide data about categories of information in a format that assists management, decision making, and program development. Additional categories and more detail in each section can be requested or provided depending on the requirements of a given situation.

RG